26.7.95 34 Coniger Road London SWB3TA England-Dear Gran-Carlo and Renata, Jim Cushing has passed on to me your comments on the paper of l'atrich and La Rivière and myself. I now think I understand goon argument much more clearly, and recognize that you have made no logical blunder. Setting aside the issues about determinism wasses ruleterminism in evaluating the relevant Counterfactual, the crucial result une can all accept is your familia (4) imp * (BM Compl) > 7 (OM-LOC) V 7 (ER-LOC) g completely agree that you Tonly cleduce -1 (EB-200) it we assume (UM-LUC) and that under the assumption of 7 (04-LOC) one consot deduce 7 (ER-LUC). He me point that I still do not renderstand is copy & helps south persoful Coexistence of quantum mechanics and spaceof relativity. 7 (UM-LOC) seems just as much at

. odds with rolativity as 7 (ER-LUC). They both exhibit space-box parameter defendence, and the fact that T(FR-LOC) is referred to by Einstein as "spoonly" does not seem to amount to a convincing argument for preferring of (OM-Low to of (ER-LOC). This is what led to own confusion in trying to reconstruct your argument as deriging the validity of (att n Compl) > 7 (L-LUC) We felt this derived must be required to make sense of your peucefol Coexistence claims. But I now see this was not what you were trying to do, but only to strong the nondeducibles of 7 (FR-Lue) semplicater. In order to push the peregol coexisters claim remember, we tried to undermine * ly identifying (admitted controversially)
an additional sufficient assumption of determinism. I will now re-droft our paper, to see it

there is still something of interest and clarification to be solvaged now that we are all agreed on the logical points. I have been very sony la min the Bielefeld Conference. My tack is improving slowly but is still very sore and painful. with my last misles I hickory